

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

WILLIAM H. BALL,

Plaintiff(s),

v.

EQUIFAX INFORMATION SERVICES,

Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:24-cv-01449-GMN-NJK

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Plaintiff has failed to update his address. *See* Docket No. 8; *see also* Docket No. 9. “A party, not the district court, bears the burden of keeping the court apprised of any changes in [her] mailing address.” *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1441 (9th Cir. 1988) (*per curiam*); *see also In re Hammer*, 940 F.2d 524, 526 (9th Cir. 1991). To that end, the local rules require that litigants immediately file written notification of any change of address, and the local rules expressly warn that failure to do so may result in case-dispositive sanctions. *See* Local Rule IA 3-1.

On January 15, 2025, the Court ordered Plaintiff to update his address by February 5, 2025, and warned that failing to do so may result in dismissal. Docket No. 8 at 1. Despite that warning, Plaintiff has not updated his address.

Plaintiff has disobeyed the local rules and the Court’s order requiring prompt updating of a litigant’s address. Plaintiff’s failure to update his address, his disobedience with the local rules, and his disobedience of the Court’s orders are abusive litigation practices that have interfered with the Court’s ability to hear this case, delayed litigation, disrupted the Court’s timely management of its docket, wasted judicial resources, and threatened the integrity of the Court’s orders and the orderly administration of justice. Sanctions less drastic than dismissal are unavailable because Plaintiff has refused to comply with the orders of this Court notwithstanding the warning that case-dispositive sanctions may be imposed.

1 Accordingly, in light of the circumstances outlined above, the undersigned
2 **RECOMMENDS** that this case be **DISMISSED** without prejudice and that Plaintiff's application
3 to proceed *in forma pauperis* be **DENIED** as moot.

4 Dated: February 6, 2025

5 
6 Nancy J. Koppe
United States Magistrate Judge

7
8 **NOTICE**

9 This report and recommendation is submitted to the United States District Judge assigned
10 to this case pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). A party who objects to this report and
11 recommendation must file a written objection supported by points and authorities within fourteen
12 days of being served with this report and recommendation. Local Rule IB 3-2(a). Failure to file
13 a timely objection may waive the right to appeal the district court's order. *Martinez v. Ylst*, 951
14 F.2d 1153, 1157 (9th Cir. 1991).